

# **IOWA HIGHWAY RESEARCH BOARD**

*Minutes of March 30, 2001*

## **Regular Board Members Present**

J. Adam  
J. George  
L. Greimann  
D. Julius  
B. Keierleber  
R. Krauel

K. Mahoney  
J. Odgaard  
D. Osipowicz  
J. Selmer  
W. Weiss  
J. Witt

## **Alternate Board Members Present**

R. Gould for S. Larson  
L. Brehm  
J. Ites  
G. Miller

W. Nixon  
C. Van Buskirk  
J. Weber  
R. Younie

## **With No Representation**

T. Myers

## **Secretary**

M. Dunn

## **Visitors**

Omar Smadi  
Dale Harrington  
Jenny Balis  
Tom Stoner  
Steve DeVries  
Gordon Smith  
Ahmad Abu-Hawash  
Saleem Baig  
Sara Buseman  
Ed Engle  
Mike Heitzman  
Larry Jesse  
Ian MacGillivray  
Mohammad Mujeeb  
Jim Cable  
F. Wayne Klaiber

*CTRE*  
*CTRE - PCC Center*  
*Federal Highway Administration*  
*Harrison County Engineer*  
*ICEA Service Bureau*  
*Iowa Concrete Paving Association*  
*Iowa Department of Transportation*  
*Iowa Department of Transportation*  
*Iowa Department of Transportation*  
*Iowa Department of Transportation*  
*Iowa Department of Transportation*  
*Iowa Department of Transportation*  
*Iowa Department of Transportation*  
*Iowa Department of Transportation*  
*Iowa State University, CCE Dept.*  
*Iowa State University, CCE Dept.*

**The meeting was held in the Large Materials Conference Room at the Iowa Department of Transportation, Ames, Iowa. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 A.M. by J. Adam.**

#### **Agenda Review/Modification**

- No changes.

#### **Approval of the Minutes**

- The minutes from the February 23, 2001 meeting were accepted with no additions or corrections.

#### **Proposal, ‘Field Testing of Abrasive Delivery System in Winter Maintenance’**

- This proposal was given as a follow up to the problem statement presented at the February meeting. Wilfrid Nixon presented the proposed test site, methods, objectives, tasks, test details, time frame and budget.
- Brian Keierleber - Are you going to track temperatures? That is one of the key variables.
- Wilfrid Nixon - We can certainly track it, but what we can't do, of course, is control it. A winter like this would be really great (for this project). Yes, we've got to keep track of temperature.
- Dennis Osipowicz - Including pavement temperature?
- Wilfrid Nixon - If we can. We might look into ways of getting a sensor into the pavement. If you think that's important, we can look into ways of doing it.
- Dennis Osipowicz - I think it's very important, because you could have pavement temperatures considerably different from the ambient air temperature both early and late in the year.
- Kevin Mahoney - We have a number of infrared thermometers that we've truck mounted to the frame that are reasonably accurate. The operator can see, as he goes down the road, what the pavement temperature is. We have the two RWIS sites in the Iowa City area that you can maybe do some thermal mapping and do some comparisons too.
- Wilfrid Nixon - We will, at the very least, do some thermal mapping using the infrared thermometers. I'm not sure what it would cost to actually put a sensor on the road. My figures on that may be outdated, but it used to be fairly expensive, a single site used to be \$15,000 - \$20,000.
- Kevin Mahoney - A lot of the cost is the communication part of it. If you just wanted to archive it and then download it later, it's a lot less.

- Dennis Osipowicz - How close are the RWIS sites?
- Kevin Mahoney - There is one on Interstate-80, at the Iowa City/Coralville border and one on 218, at the Melrose interchange, plus 2 in Cedar Rapids.
- Wilfrid Nixon - There are 4 sites within 20 miles. That and the infrared thermometer, I think, would be enough. The infrared thermometers aren't very expensive any more, I think around a few hundred dollars.
- Dennis Osipowicz moved to accept the proposal for a 2 year project starting May 1, 2001 with a \$151,920 budget. Randall Krauel seconded. It was approved by the Board with 12 yes, 0 no and 0 abstaining.

### **Policy change regarding the number of board members**

- John Adam reported on the letter that was enclosed in the board packet from Tom Cackler. Sandra Larson has been added to the board as an additional DOT representative. Roger Gould is her alternate. The board now has 14 members, each with an alternate.
- Dennis Osipowicz - Does the DOT establish the make-up of the board? We've asked to get our TRB representative on and the letter basically says, thanks, but no thanks.
- John Adam - It is my understanding that the DOT is the policy maker for the board. Ian is here, maybe you can better address that.
- Ian MacGillivray - That was reviewed here, and conclusion from our management was that we wanted to keep the balance that we have now. We would like to incorporate your TRB rep, along with our technical staff, as staff support for this process. We felt that would be more appropriate and presents adequate representation.
- Dennis Osipowicz - So the DOT basically establishes the make-up of this board.
- Ian MacGillivray - Yes. It's an advisory board to the department to manage the program. Basically the guidance provided is what's used for management. In this case, that was the decision that came out of our management
- Wade Weiss - So, have we added representative then?
- Ian MacGillivray - What we have done is added one representative from the Highway Division, reflecting the reorganization of the Department of Transportation. We cover our functional areas now, which are engineering, operations and our field functions. In addition, our Materials office, which is our primary internal research program. The conclusion was that we felt that is what it took to adequately represent the department and the different types of technical activities that are involved.
- Tom Stoner - I just wanted to add to that because if you review the minutes and tapes from a

few meetings ago, I was persistent to get an answer from you if the counties could expand their roll to have 7 and you almost assured me at that meeting that that would happen. I'm kind of curious how that had changed.

- Ian MacGillivray - Well, I'm not going to debate it. That was a decision made by our management as to what they felt was the best method of providing input, advise, and balanced program direction.
- Wade Weiss - Who is that management?
- Ian MacGillivray - Essentially, Tom Cackler.
- Wade Weiss - Okay, so Tom Cackler is the one that we need to speak with regrading our representation. I agree with Tom (Stoner). I'm very confused by all this. It seems as though that we were all working together on this project, as far as, how we were going to change.
- Ian MacGillivray - The recommendation from the group of the county engineers about adding a representative and focusing on the TRB representative was shared with our management and discussed quite thoroughly. If your concern is that you message or recommendation was not heard, I assure you, it was.
- Wade Weiss - I guess I'm more concerned that a decision wasn't made to add that representative if that what's important to us with our organization. I guess maybe we can reorganize and say now that we've reorganized, we want our TRB rep on there. We've made some strides to fund that individual to go out to the annual meeting. I think that we're placing more importance on that individual's responsibilities.
- Ian MacGillivray - That was our understanding that you were. In fact, to be real direct with you, in recognition of that, the feeling was that that technical support would aid both the board and the department by incorporating it as part of our staff support process. To some extent that recommendation came from me. Recognizing that we were building some focus that's specifically dedicated to technology and research area. The way to take the best advantage of it was to have him partnered with us as staff.
- Wade Weiss - That's not happening. That's not going to happen.
- Ian MacGillivray - Why would that not happen?
- Wade Weiss - That individual is not going to sit on this board.
- Ian MacGillivray - It's our intention to have that individual to work with us in the staff process that supports the whole board program.
- Wade Weiss - That individual would support me here on the board. That would help me as a

county engineer.

- Ian MacGillivray - Our job is to help you. All of us, as staff, are to help you.
- Wade Weiss - I understand that. I would also like that individual to be sitting on this board. So I think I'll just talk to Tom Cackler, or we can all do that.
- Jim George - Ian, I believe you represented us well when you talked to management. I can kind of sense a little bit of your frustration.
- Ian MacGillivray - I wouldn't say frustration, but we had a direct discussion of this topic.
- Jim George - I guess what confuses me a little bit is that this county engineer is willing to spend his time to sit on this board, educate himself, and provide the consistency which we're looking for from our end of the operation, rather than a 3 year turn over, why he couldn't sit here. I share Tom, Wade, and Denny's concerns on this.
- Ian MacGillivray - But we would like to have consistency and continuity, I think is what you're really getting at. You guys aren't any more consistent than we are. But continuity is really what you're after and I think that's what Wade is focusing on too. Because the historic continuity helps everybody do their job. We're trying to assist the board in being a group of technical experts, not representatives of 3 jurisdictions, but rather this is an imalgamation of everyone together. One of the best ways to provide that continuity, you know Mark has been with the research program for 3 years, I've had an association with it for 20 some years, and hopefully your TRB representative will be with it for a long time. We'll maintain some continuity in that fashion. I think that's really the focus
- Wade Weiss - Our TRB rep has had prior experience with the board.
- Ian MacGillivray - Your TRB rep is Harold Jensen isn't it?
- No, it's Mark Nahra.
- Dennis Osipowicz - That happen just a year or so ago.
- Wade Weiss - In anticipation of this, Ian, because of our discussion, I think they talked to Mark Nahra and Harold Jensen. Harold hadn't been as involved, I don't think, as Mark Nahra probably will be in the future or would be.
- Ian MacGillivray - I will welcome working with Mark. He'll probably get more out of participating with staff than he will from periodic meetings as well. I hope we'll have him here providing support for everybody.
- Dennis Osipowicz - How would you anticipate using him in conjunction with staff?

- Ian MacGillivray - The same process that we go through providing support. With the program direction you're going (you're going to some spend time on it this morning, developing a pro-active agenda), there's an awful lot of work that goes into developing that pro-active agenda. Back ground support, things like focus groups, all the way through to when you select a short list of an agenda, doing research into that to help define those problem statements more, to take a look at what research in progress or recently completed research has a bearing on it, are they projects that need current work, all the way through to review technical proposals that come to us in response to a solicitation. There's an awful lot of work that needs to be done and we need to improve our work on that background work. That's a part of the technical support that needs to be done in support of the board. Our expectation is to continue to put more and more professional and technical competency into what supports this board in getting the job done. I think that's a part of what Mr. Cackler's looking at. It's part of that discussion that I had with him. But we did discuss following your original suggestion, and later when we were discussing updating this policy, the specific recommendation of the board was to add one member.
- Tom Stoner - I would remind the DOT that the county engineers were very adamant about that addition, that's why I pressed Ian to get that decision a few months ago. We did react by talking with Harold Jensen and Mark Nagra, asking Mark back on. Mark is a previous member of this board and also a previous chairman of the board. We did take time and based it on what we believed to be instructions given by DOT. This matches a little bit of the Dr. Lee's situation about 6 or 9 months ago, where the county engineers were very persistent on having research carried out and we found out our decision didn't mean a lot. Apparently it doesn't this time either. And when I see this as being another dilution of the county engineers authority on this board, I quite frankly find it insulting, but I am no longer member. I would encourage current members to find some way to make their protest, at least their dislike of the decision, heard by the DOT.
- John Adam - Any other comments on this before we move on then?

#### **Extension, HR-394, "Iowa Transportation Program Management System - Phase I"**

- Steve DeVries, Director of the County Engineer Service Bureau, presented a time and budget extension request. He reviewed the project highlights, time line and extension information. The request was for a time extension until June 30, 2002 with a budget extension of \$102,711.18.
- Wade Weiss - I have a question for Mark. I noticed that in the Primary Road Fund that we had approximately \$15,000 left for expenditures in FY 2001, and we haven't estimated anything further for this project, is that correct?
- Mark Dunn - Most likely any additional funding appropriated by this project, won't come in this fiscal year in addition to what is already set aside for this.
- Wade Weiss - It appears to me, some of it could come in 2001.
- Mark Dunn - If it does, there is room in the estimated column (on the review of funds sheet

included in the packet) on some of these multiple year projects to not expend as much as is in that portion if necessary. So there is enough money in there and it shouldn't be a problem.

- Lowell Greimann - I'm wondering about the future of this project. When do we move from a research mode to an application mode? You went through several minutes of talking about things you have found, enhancements, improvements and I think that's going to continue. It would be naive to think, ok, now we're going to be done with it; that's never going to happen. Software and hardware changes are going to continue. My guess is, what you're experiencing now is going to go on indefinitely, as long as you have this product. So, I was wondering about your continuing relationship with AIC. Do you expect to maintain them on a continual maintenance contract indefinitely, or funding indefinitely or is there an end? This is going to go on forever if it's successful because you're going to have users finding things they want. You went through things you've found just in the last 6 months. When you turn this thing loose, you're going to have a bunch more. How do you see that going in the next few years, in terms of this board?
- Steve DeVries - I do foresee this project demanding refinements and changes, but on a gradually decreasing basis until we reach a point where requests are infrequent and very easy to handle. As far as users wanting more functionality down the line, that may happen, but we are not anticipating requesting more projects, unless there would be some ground swell amongst all users to push us towards that. This thing has been a little bit of a hill to climb and I don't want to climb anymore hills. Remember the system process that we're modeling have only so much scope, and they've been pretty stable over the last 25 years..
- Wade Weiss - I'd like to address that also. The county engineers have a computer committee and I've spoken with a number of those individuals on that and they're addressing those concerns also, as far as maintenance of that system and available funding for that. They realize that's going to happen. These regional planning affiliations that we have created through ISTEA and T-21, I think that's an area where funding can come from, and it will come from our area. I agree with you Lowell, funding for maintenance for this should not come from here.
- Lowell Greimann - From what I've heard said, they're really optimistic and really like the service that this provides and is going to provide.
- Wade Weiss - Yes, and it's going to be expanded. It's kind of concentrated now, but I think the DOT is going to be a fantastic recipient of this technology.
- Wade Weiss moved to approve the time and budget extensions. Brian Keierleber seconded. It was approved by the Board with 13 yes, 0 no and 0 abstaining.

#### **Final Report, TR-433, "HWYNEEDS: Methodology, Analysis, and Evaluation"**

- Omar Smadi presented the information from the final report for TR-433, including methodology, results, and recommendations.

- Jim Witt - On the gravel roads needs, basically what it came down to was vehicle miles and number of roads?
- Omar Smadi - At this point, yes. The committee is still looking at that in terms of tightening that a little bit for the secondary system. You saw the relationship with the farm to market as very tight, the correlation is excellent there. But we still have some problems in the secondary system. When we look at the numbers, there were changes between -10% to +25% (I believe), and the committee would like to see everything between -10% and +20% at least to start with. You have to remember, every time you introduce a change, there will be changes at the other end in terms of the needs. The main goal was that we wanted to come up with an objective and consistent approach to stabilize the process.
- Brian Keierleber - Does that mean they wouldn't take into account the aggregate cost and snow issues and those type of issues any more?
- Omar Smadi - We looked at that and the data that we had and the data that the DOT had, doesn't support any relationship between the needs and gravel costs, whether you have a quarry in your county or whether you get gravel from somewhere else. The cost numbers did not support any relationship in that area.
- Lowell Greimann - You're trying to compare actual needs versus predicted needs. What's actual needs mean? What's "right"?
- Omar Smadi - Actual needs is the needs that HWYNEEDS generated by the program. It looks at the condition and generates needs over a 20 year period for reconstruction, rehab and maintenance.
- Lowell Greimann - I thought that's what you were doing too, but with an improved model.
- Omar Smadi - Yes. The idea is the fluctuation from one needs study to another (which is every 4 years), you have one county that gains 50%, and at the next needs study they're down 30%, and the next one they're up 20%. So by taking 3, we're thinking that we're close to the actual need and then we're calibrating against that. One of the problems we have is the funding has to be based on the needs and the are conditioned based. We have to keep the formula based on that and no body knows that exactly. We took each point and did statistical analysis on that. In a nutshell, we're trying to stabilize the outcome. What's the best way to do that? That's the issue that we're dealing with.
- Jim Witt - My worry is, the counties that have been on this 10 year bottom of the ladder, are now going to be subject to being leveled out.
- Omar Smadi - But what you have to keep in mind is that's the reason we looked at 3 studies. Which means at one point, you had recent condition data on your roads. That's why we took the '90, '94 and '98, which means the data collection was done in a 10 year cycle, so at some point in these 3 need studies, you have up to date information. One of the things we did before



going into this, was to have a 3 study rolling average. That produced the least fluctuation from one needs study to another. But the legislature says it has to be done every 4 years based on needs. This was the best approach we could come up with, especially on the gravel roads. Even if you collect conditions this year, with the hard winter, what difference does it do.

- Jim Witt - What I'm saying is, in that 12 years, you really only had 1 inventory.
- Omar Smadi - Yes, some might have 2, but that's why we took the 3 at least to get the ups and downs for each county.
- Jacob Odgaard - Isn't it basically an optimization process?
- Omar Smadi - That's what I would like to do, but HWYNEEDS is not.
- Jacob Odgaard - I understand there are a number of legal constraints.
- Omar Smadi - Not even that, if we change the methodology of the computer program HWYNEEDS, to do optimization, it would solve a majority of the problems. But that means we have to invest in it and we have to do it. That's why one of the recommendations for future research is to actually say HWYNEEDS does not cut it any more. This is technology that was developed in the late 70's, it has a lot of inherent problems that we can't fix, unless we change the methodology.
- If you have any comments on the report, forward them to Omar Smadi by the middle of April, then he will proceed with the final printing.
- Jim Witt moved for approval. Jim George seconded. It was approved by the Board with 13 yes, 0 no and 0 abstaining.

### **Review of final request for proposals drafts for Continuous Monitoring**

- Mark Dunn, Jacob Odgaard, Wilfrid Nixon, and Lowell Greimann had made the recommended revisions to the request for proposals on Sensors and Continuous Monitoring. It has been broken up into two parts: Transportation Information Systems for Road System Managers and Transportation Information Systems for Road System Users.
- John Adam - With part 1 and part 2, part 2 is an evaluation of new or emerging technologies. That's something that can go on indefinitely. Is this something that we see continuing? There are always going to be new technologies out there to evaluate. I guess I'm having trouble on what would be the conclusion, or if it will be a continuing process.
- Jacob Odgaard - Based on the background work that I did on this, there really is no conclusion to this project, but there are a number of techniques that are emerging and being investigated. What I was thinking is that the study could include a survey of what was in the making right now. At least so we have an inventory of what's in the making right now and how do those

types of techniques compare with the techniques that we are already using. Because I don't have a good feel for what is there, and I could imagine that others would be in the same boat.

- Lowell Greimann - I think of it more as an educational type of thing. My sense, at least in my area of structures, we are going to get more and more into continuous monitoring. It feels like this could help the DOT get started on some of that more, in these two areas. That's the way I'm thinking of this. In a way, it's like self-educating ourselves.
- Wilfrid Nixon - I would agree that this may be something that the board comes back to on a regular basis. There are a lot of new sensors and systems coming, not just in these areas, but in a whole range of areas. We can't do good research in developing tools, unless we know about them. So there is a function in gathering the data, doing a synthesis, presenting that to the board, and allowing the board to consider, whether at this time, the new technologies are something that are worth developing for Iowa. If they do, there is part 2 when we look at how to implement this information.
- Jacob Odgaard - I think as far as the continuous aspect of those sensors and devices, it could be very useful because you can monitor a bridge or a condition over a period of time and observe that it is getting worse, up to a certain point, but you may then discover that after that, nothing else is happening. It's just stationary. So maybe there's no point in going out and doing anything. I think the continuous part is something that could be very useful.
- F. Wayne Klaiber - Currently I'm serving as chair on TRB committee A2CO5 - Dynamics and Field Testing of Bridges, and I get reports from time to time to review. Right now, I have a report on my desk reviewing exactly what you're asking for here. I will have to write a letter asking permission to give it to you, but I'll give you that and then you can see if you want to fill in the voids. With the parts I've reviewed, I think it's excellently prepared. It's done by a group of 6 different universities. I'd like to get that in your hands so you can see if this is different for what you had in mind, or if it's what you had in mind. It is from the road system managers side.  
(He will get this report to Mark Dunn.)
- John Adam - How would the board like to proceed? My perspective is that there is certainly value in going this route to evaluate the new emerging technologies. So I think the overall intension is worth while, it's just a question on how we accommodate it.
- Kevin Mahoney - Do you think there would be any merit of attempting to tie some of this together? The technology or the instrumentation at a given site is there for one purpose, can it be added on to serve another need? If we say, monitor bridge decks for some such element, can we monitor that for bridge deck temperature and use it for winter time use, or traffic counting, speed indication, motorist alerts and such?
- Wilfrid Nixon - I think those synergies of information would definitely exist, but may not be clear enough to us at this point to include them in an RFP. Hopefully as we develop the

research, those may be the areas that we should look at. The big issue is, as you gather more data, that doesn't mean that you are any smarter in understanding what to do with it, but you would hope it would. That too is part of the process, whether decision support systems are also needed.

- Kevin Mahoney - I suppose then, there is the value added portion of that versus gathering information for just gathering sake.
- John Adam - What about Wilfrid's suggestion of treating these separately? Perhaps, the one for the road system users, we could proceed with. For the other, we could get the report that Wayne has and evaluate that for the road system managers then determine what to do.
- Jacob Odgaard - If we are doing an RFP, we should expect that the proposals would review what is already available on a cursory basis. It seems to me that if there are reports, like the one referred to here, available, that would be mentioned in a proposal. Whoever is proposing to do the study would know about that and know about the holes in such a study. I'm just seeing us going through another report here. It's up to us to determine where the holes are and perhaps refine the RFP and that could be another challenge.
- Wilfrid Nixon - If you do put the road system managers RFP out, and the proposals you receive in response do not adequately cover the knowledge above and beyond what we already know is out there, we are not obligated to accept it.
- Dennis Osipowicz - I think this is something that, with technology the way it is today, we're going to need to know what's going on out there. If it's there, we should be using it in our design and our maintenance of our infrastructures. I think we could go for both proposals, like Wilfrid said, if we don't like it we don't have to accept it. But we did talk about that a couple months ago, where the researchers are putting quite a bit of effort in putting these proposals together, then if we reject them, they have a lot of time in there. That may be the only problem in going out with the one for the managers.
- Lowell Greimann - It has happened before.
- Mark Dunn will send these RFP's out now. The technical contacts will be Jacob Odgaard and Wilfrid Nixon. The proposed split on funding is decided after the specifics on the proposal(s) are reviewed by the board.

### **Review/Approval of the IHRB Business Plan**

- Mark Dunn reviewed the suggested changes that were made to the business plan. Pilot Projects for novel ideas was a new section that Wilfrid Nixon had written this with the intent to get some mechanism for innovation type projects. This would include someone's out of the ordinary idea that might have a real impact if it works, but we have to do a little bit of preliminary research to see if it is feasible. The board will remain as the decision maker as to the direction the money is spent. Proposals can be accepted at any time during the year.

- Christie Van Buskirk - In section B, the Pilot Project, I would suggest to change the sentence structure a little bit to say, "The board may fund up to a maximum of 5 such projects". Currently, it says "will" instead of "may".
- Another area that was added to was "Continuation of Previous Projects". After discussion, it was decided that the current language is sufficient and gives the board the latitude to act as they see fit in each circumstance.
- The Composition of the Board was also revisited.
- Wade Weiss - We should go back to page one. I'm concerned about the change of the policy and procedure manual. First of all, the total number of the board should be 14, not 13, to match the makeup written here. And then, I take the letter to Mr. Adam as a "thank you for your opportunity to ask that we include the TRB rep, but we're not going to allow that". I feel as though that's kind of just rammed down our throats and our opinion doesn't count. We were given a copy of the minutes from a meeting where it was discussed and maybe Ian can address that. At that time, he stated his proposal would include our TRB rep. I don't know if that proposal was ever submitted, if it's in written form, and if it was, I'd be interested in seeing that. I can't approve this business plan when a letter was sent out March 23, one week ago, and now were going to approve this business plan today. That's fairly hard for me to stomach. I think we should have had more discussion on this or maybe this is the place to have it right now.
- Doug Julius - I guess the comment I have is on draft 5, the DOT had 3 engineers and now draft 6 has 4 and we never discussed this in the last draft, so I guess I'm wondering where that change came from.
- John Adam - That change would have been as a result from the memo from Tom Cackler.
- Ian MacGillivray - I asked that that change be added to the business plan as we were updating it in view of these directions reached with Mr. Cackler. You asked if a proposal had been forwarded to Mr. Cackler. Yes, I shared that with him shortly after the meeting when we first had that discussion. Again, later this winter, February or early March, we were talking about formalizing or finalizing this process, I reminded him again about what the advice and input had been. If you're looking for a formal proposal, there is no written report.
- Wade Weiss - I'd like to understand why, better than this one paragraph, what went into that decision making. As I look at it, the engineering bureau, which I believe Roger is representing today, I don't really know if that is really needed just because of reorganization. Is he going to provide something to this board that say Mark Nahra, with the Transportation Research Board, is not going to? I welcome Roger here, it's not that, it's more as to our needs. I'm still learning a lot of the process, but having been involved in research in the past, I would welcome someone that is well versed as Mark Nahra, and as adamant about pursuing a lot of those topics. It concerned me a little bit that Ian didn't know that Mark Nahra was our representative and maybe that would lend a little bit more weight in that decision. I don't know that. I do not

look for approval of this today. I think we should have Mr. Cackler explain, I know he's very busy, but maybe we need some further discussion on this.

- John Adam - There's two ways to go. One is to vote now and accept or not. The other would be to delay that and see if there is a means to have your questions and concerns addressed in a more thorough fashion.
- Lowell Greimann - I don't see an urgency to be pushed into a yes/no vote right now. With listening to this, this came as a surprise and I would like to think that a couple of people could talk to Mr. Cackler. More working together might be helpful here in the next month.
- John Adam - It sounds as if it might be better not to bring this to a vote today. Kevin maybe you could suggest how to get the concerns to Mr. Cackler.
- Kevin Mahoney - My two cents here, is that I don't think there should be any surprises. I have sensitivity to that. I think we ought to table this until we get the issue resolved. I get the distinct feeling that you feel the rug was pulled out from under you without just or adequate explanation.
- Brian Keierleber - If you read through the minutes from the meeting, it was agreed to to add two members, one from the DOT and one from the counties. Then, suddenly it's dictated back to us, somebody lied to us, you said yes, then you said no.
- Wade Weiss - That was what was going to be proposed.
- Lowell Greimann - It was a discussion topic, as I remember.
- Brian Keierleber - Yes, it kind of comes awful hard and sudden that way Kevin.
- Kevin Mahoney - You're right.
- Wade Weiss - To me, it just drives a wedge and there's no reason for that. I think the votes that I've seen happen, are normally unanimous. I don't think there's an "us against them" and it shouldn't be perceived that way. When you see something like this, it seems to me that someone else is thinking there is an "us" and "them". That may or may not be the case. I would like to strongly recommend again, that our TRB rep would sit on this board and that our council with the county engineers possibly be discussed with them. I may not be the one to discuss that with, there are guys that know more about it than I do and I'd like them contacted.
- Kevin Mahoney - It may be more the way the message is delivered rather than what the message is. The answer may still be the same, I don't know. I don't have the background here and I wasn't involved in the early discussions. My point right now is that how the message is delivered is important and maybe there is some type of appeal. I think we ought to honor that.

- Wade Weiss - We've allowed more involvement. Ian has brought a lot to this group, as far as I'm concerned, as far as reviewing a lot of these proposals and changing the business plan. That was somewhat of a change here and adding another individual, this may be very good. But I guess we've made end roads into making some positive changes also. I think the move of the executive board appointing Mark Nahra was a very positive in saying we're going to fund him to go to the annual meeting. Not all of us want to do that or have the facilities to do that. I think that was a very positive move. That's somewhat of a re-organization on our part.
- Kevin Mahoney - Ian, do you have any comments on how to address this further?
- Ian MacGillivray - I think it would be best for several of us to return and have a direct discussion with Tom. I think the depth of the feeling was not adequately conveyed. You may want to consider adopting the administrative guide without dealing with this issue and leave this issue for final action following the meeting.
- John Adam - Mark made the point that we've been operating under the plan already. I would just as soon table this and vote on it in the future. Ian, if you could coordinate a meeting with Tom Cackler with whomever the county would prefer to be involved in that and we'll proceed after that.
- Mark Dunn - Other than the membership of the board, are there any other changes to the business plan?
- Randall Krauel - You might insert in the appointment of the two engineers from municipalities nominated by the "Iowa Chapter" of the APWA.

### **Research topic prioritization**

- It was decided that the lists of topics will be combined into one list (including changes within categories, more detail on a few topics, and changes from Dale Harrington), sent out to the members and alternates and reviewed by them. Mark will also include instructions and a preliminary ballot (one ballot per regular seat on the board) for this initial review. There will be a date on the memo stating when they need to be returned to him. The results will then be tabulated and sent out in the regular board packet. Members and alternates should then review the topics in ranked order and be prepared to discuss and vote on them at the April meeting.

### **New Business**

- Ian MacGillivray - I'd like to share something with you before you leave, and I will probably have a further report that will come out to you before the next meeting. If you want to look at the NCHRP, the web site is included here, but what I've given you is a list of current activities. These are brand new things being started by NCHRP. It relates a little to, "is somebody else working on some of the topics that you've seen". Attached are a couple of journals. One of them is the *Public Roads Magazine* from FHWA. You can look it up on the web, if you don't

have access to it. Another is a very good report which comes out a few times a year, called *Research and Technology Transporter*. This is the latest in the way of a technology transfer journal from FHWA and again it reports what's happening at the national level. It isn't just results, it's what work are they focusing on. Then in the background, are a couple of reports from the international side of what AASHTO and FHWA are doing. Technology scans looking at what's going on in other countries. You may have seen one of these reports, it's a little bit old, a couple of the others are quite new. One reason I gave you the older one is that it also lists all the topics where that type of work has been carried out in the last couple of years. It's something else for us to look at and see how that relates to our own interest. That doesn't mean that something you're interested in that has a reflection in this is not valid. It may mean just a different focus, how to take advantage of it, how to build on it, how to extract from it, or what to do that's different. I share it with you for that type of background reading. We will get you the list of the newly approved NCHRP program, which was actually voted on and finalized yesterday.

**John Adam adjourned the meeting.**

The video for TR-410, "Steel Beam Precast Units: A Low Volume Road Bridge Alternative", was available for viewing following the meeting for those interested.

**Date of Next Meeting**

**THE NEXT MEETING WILL BE HELD APRIL 27, 2001 AT 9:00 A.M. IN THE LARGE MATERIALS CONFERENCE ROOM AT THE IOWA DOT.**

---

Mark Dunn, Secretary